

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on April 6, 2012, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire July 6, 2012. A two month extension, extending the period of response to September 6, 2012, is filed herewith.

Claims 1, 4-10, 16, 17, 19, 21-30 and 47-50 are pending in the above-identified application, and are rejected under 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 103 for the reasons set forth below.

In the current paper, Claims 1 and 10 are amended in response to the rejection under 35 USC 112 and to clarify the subject matter of the claimed invention. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-30, and 47-50 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for reasons set forth in paragraphs 3 through 10 of the Office action.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to recite "system" claims in accordance with the Examiner's instruction in paragraph 3 of the Office action. The remaining dependent claims are also amended to reflect this change.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to clarify the context of the "data storage device" and the "housing" in response to the rejection raised in paragraph 4 of the Office action.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to include a colon after "including", and are otherwise amended in a manner believed to address the concerns raised in paragraph 5 of the Office action.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended in a manner believed to clarify the semicolon after "rectangular shape", and are thus believed

to fully address the concerns raised in paragraph 6 of the Office action. Should the examiner still feel this semicolon is improper, the examiner is invited to change the semicolon to a comma, provided the apparent meaning of the claim is not altered by this change.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to remove recitations of "adapted to" in response to the rejection raised in paragraph 7 of the Office action.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to remove the limitations cited in paragraph 8 of the Office action.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to remove "to be abraded" in accordance with the rejection raised in paragraph 9 of the Office action.

Regarding the rejection raised in paragraph 10, Claim 1 is amended to remove "relatively" as required, but Applicants traverse the rejection directed to the recitation of "diamond-like hardness" recited in Claim 10. Specifically, as set forth in Applicants' specification on page 62, lines 7-17, the term "diamond-like hardness" is well known in the art. As such, Applicants contend the use of this phrase in Claim 10 provides a clear measure of degree, and clearly defines the recited "abradeable protective coating" structure.

No new matter is entered by the amendments mentioned above. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Rejections over Liu and Wood

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922).

Claim 1 recites (in pertinent part) "...a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." Support for "having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in...." is provided in Claim 38 as filed (now canceled).

In contrast to the above-quoted limitation, neither Liu nor Wood suggest a portable card that includes "a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claim 1. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claim 1.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and are therefore believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 1.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 10 recites "...a hard disk drive storage medium...said magnetic material having an areal density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes..." Claim 10 is distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 1.

Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10, and are therefore believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Nishiyama

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942). Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating this rejection.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood.

Rejections over Liu/Wood and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood.

Rejections over Liu, Wood and Nishiyama

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30, 38 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922) and Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942).

As set forth above Claim 1 recites (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." and Claim 10 is recites (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said magnetic material having an areal density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes...", and neither Liu nor Wood even remotely suggest these

features in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claims 1 and 10. Nishiyama fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claims 1 and 10. Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating the rejection directed to this claim.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627 and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu, Wood and Levy

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

As set forth above Claim 1 recites (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." and Claim 10 recites (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said magnetic material having an areal density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes...", and neither Liu nor Wood even remotely suggest this features in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claims 1 and 10. Levy fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claims 1 and 10.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Nishiyama

Claim 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507). Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating this rejection.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Levy and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Levy in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627 and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Levy.

Rejections over Liu, Wood, Nishiyama and Levy

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30, 38 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922), Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942) and Levy (US Patent No. 4,884,507).

As set forth above Claim 1 recites (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." and Claim 10 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said magnetic material having an areal density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes...", and neither Liu nor Wood even remotely suggest these features in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claims 1 and 10. As set forth above, Nishiyama and Levy fail to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10. Each of these

claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claims 1 and 10. Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating the rejection directed to this claim.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth

above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Nishiyama/Levy.

Rejections over Liu, Wood and Porter

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30, 38 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922) and Porter (US Patent No. 4,202,445).

As set forth above Claim 1 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part) "...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." and Claim 10 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part) "...said magnetic material having an areal

density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes...", and neither Liu nor Wood even remotely suggest these features in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claims 1 and 10. Porter fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claims 1 and 10. Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating the rejection directed to this claim.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Nishiyama

Claim 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter in view of Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942). Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating this rejection.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter and Foley

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter for reasons similar to those

set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter.

Rejections over Liu, Wood, Porter and Nishiyama

Claims 1, 4-10, 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30, 38 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (2001/0052543) in view of Wood (US 5,041,922), Nishiyama (US Patent No. 5,721,942) and Porter (US Patent No. 4,202,445).

As set forth above Claim 1 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said plurality of magnetic domains having an areal density of between 2 megabits per sq. in. to about 10 gigabits per sq. in. and having a storage capability of more than 500 megabytes..." and Claim 10 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part) "a hard disk drive storage medium...said magnetic material having an areal density of about 10 gigabits per sq. in and having a storage capability in the range of at least 500 megabytes...", and neither Liu nor Wood even remotely suggest these features in combination with the other recited limitations recited in Claims 1 and 10. Nishiyama and Porter fail to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood for reasons set forth above. As such, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references to produce the structures of Claims 1 and 10.

Claims 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 16-17, 19, 21-25, 27-28, 30 and 47-48 depend from Claim 10. Each of these claims is believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claims 1 and 10. Claim 38 was previously canceled, thus obviating the rejection directed to this claim.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama and Hirasawa

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama in view of Hirasawa (US Patent No. 6,250,552).

Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Hirasawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama and Bajorek

Claims 26 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood in view of Bajorek (US Patent No. 6,482,330).

Claims 19, 26, 47 and 49 depend from Claim 10, and are believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Bajorek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama and Mizoguchi

Claim 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama in view of Mizoguchi (US Patent No. 5,689,105).

Claim 29 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Davis for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Mizoguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama and Meeks

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama in view of Meeks (US Patent No. 6,268,919).

Claim 48 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Meeks fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama.

Rejections over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama and Foley


Claim 50 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama in view of Foley (US Patent No. 4,518,627).

Claim 50 depends from Claim 10, and is believed to be distinguished over Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama for reasons similar to those set forth above with reference to Claim 10, and Foley fails to overcome the deficiencies of Liu/Wood/Porter/Nishiyama.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe Claims 1, 4-10, 16, 17, 19, 21-30 and 47-50 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834
408-451-5902

Customer No. 022888